

Applicant: Veli Kääsmä et al.
Application No.: 10/507,451
Response to Office action dated Aug. 16, 2005
Amendment filed November 16, 2005

Remarks

Claims 8–18 remain pending in the application. In the Office action dated Aug. 16, 2005, claims 8, 10, and 11 were rejected as indefinite, and claims 8–18 were rejected as obvious over Lobel WO 01/14607 in view of Takagi and further in view of Rinehart et al.

Applicant has made clarifying corrections suggested by the examiner, and amended claims 8 and 18 to limit the claims to a paper or board web, and to limit the method of applying a coating to a web of paper or board to spraying the coating on to the the web of paper or board. The preamble of the claims now forms a positive limitation, breathing life and breath into the claims. Thus the claims as now amended clearly distinguish over copying or printing technology which forms an image which is transferred to a paper web. Lobel WO01/14607 (US 6,556,804, Lobel et al.) does not spray a coating directly on to a paper or board web but on to transfer bands 41, 42 which then transfer to the paper web. Lobel et al. does not disclose a coating process but a printing process. The preamble and the claims have been amended to clearly distinguish over a printing or copying method, by claiming a coating method which simultaneously coats both sides of a paper or board web.


Lobel WO01/14607 (US 6,556,804, Lobel et al.) discloses a printer or copier, Takagi discloses a magnetic toner, and Rinehart et al. discloses a thermoplastic layer formed on a flexible two-dimensional substrate. To show that the claims as amended are obvious over the combination of references, the examiner must provide a motivation and expectation of success for applicant's claimed invention, of essentially simultaneously coating both sides of a paper or board web with a dry powder which is in part inorganic and in part polymeric binder. A motivation and expectation of success within the prior art means the prior art must show that the applicant's claimed invention is possible and practical. The prior art is so lacking in a teaching of how to combine the references that to apply the examiner's reasoning to the claims, as amended, would require hindsight.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant: Veli Käsmä et al.
Application No.: 10/507,451
Response to Office action dated Aug. 16, 2005
Amendment filed November 16, 2005

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.
Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Patrick J.G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870
Amdt3.res